ment to see that nothing happened to them because of the situation created outside. I have nothing to add to what I said on the previous occasion.

Sri B. P. KADAM.—Sir.....

(*Interruptions.*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, Order. I have given a chance to the Hon'ble Member and the matter ends there. With regard to the point raised by Sri V. S. Patil, I do not know how they would arise. It has to be brought in a proper form and procedure and not by throwing out an idea like this.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—It you say that there is no doubt, can you define our precinct even now ? On what particular portion of this big building, Vidhana Soudha, you have got the jurisdiction ? Is it ever possible ? Is it on the Ground Floor or First Floor or Second Floor ? Where is your jurisdiction ?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Sira).—Sir, not that I am intervening, but some time back you were pleased to observe in a circular about your jurisdiction. This House wants to see that the Speaker is given the power to protect the rights of the Hon. Members. Unless that power is with the Speaker, I think, the whole thing will be in the air.

Speaker's Statement re : the Precincts of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member Sri Muckannappa has referred to certain old things. I would call upon him to give accurate reference to everything he has got in his mind so that I may deal with them. Therefore, I do not propose to deal with that aspect. With regard to the point raised about precincts, Sri Suntankar wanted to know whether under the Act 15 of 1951, the jurisdiction of this House or of the Speaker extends to a distance of half a mile radius with this Hall as the centre. This Act does not confer any special jurisdiction upon the House nor is there any statute of this type to confer jurisdiction so as to put restriction on meetings or processions near the place of meeting of the Legislative Assembly. The object of the Act is very clear. One need not therefore go into the question of 'precincts', But, this does not mean that the question of defining precincts of the Mysore Legislature does not merit consideration. I said, it is a difficult question. The House will have to apply its mind or the Committee appointed by the House or the Rules Committe or this matter has to be brought before the House so that the House may apply its mind and define it. It is not the Speaker that can do it as he pleases. If I were to decide, let the House give me the power ; I will try to study it and do it. I think, this question was raised when I was a member of another House some years back. Then the circumstances were totally different. The Assembly was carrying on busines in a building which was by itself exclusively

(Mr. SPEAKER)

at their disposal. So, I would like to do nothing unless I am called upon by the House to definitely say what the precincts of this House are.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA (Hebbur).—The Legislative Assembly Hall is under the Speaker. A separate Hall should be arranged to avoid these complications.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order. Why not the Member bring it in appropriate method ?

Sri G. V. GOWDA (Palya).—We understand that the Speaker has got to give us protection and peotect our rights and privileges.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the member asks for protection it will be given at a time when he asks for it.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Unless that is know, which has got to be done by the Hon'ble Speaker, steps will have to be taken to see that it is defined.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Precincts is a legal concept. For instance though voting is not done or debate is not done in the lounge, invariably it is included within the precincts. Certain parts of the Gallery are also included in the precincts. Library is treated on certain occasions as precincts.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—The Spaeker has got to apply his mind.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—The Hon'ble Home Minister the other day attributed motives to our token strike, and tried to misguide the House by making certain remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If that is the trend, I will not give the opportunity to the member to continue and take the consequences. Motives have been attributed to Government. If it is a factual statement, I allow. There is already a feeling prevailing that I am more courteous than is necessary.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I will deal with only the points. Our Hungerstrike was not likely to cause any breach of peace. There was nothing illegal in our strike for 24 hours.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have told the Members from the beiginning that one of them may speak and I had given him a chance. I do net want anybody to carry a feeling that because the Members belongs to a minority party he is not given a chance. I have been fair beyond what was normal.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Then he said that our hungerstrike was in contradiction with our Oath of Allegiance to the Constitution. I am astonished at such a remark from the Hon'ble Home Minister. How does our token hungerstrike contravene the Oath of Allegiance passes my conprehension. In what way he has gone againist the Oath ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will not allow this Member to say one sentence more if he goes on arguing.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I am not arguing. I am simply dealing with the points raised. When there was nothing unconstitutional that

we did, how can he say that it is in contradiction with the Oath of allegiance? There is another point, the Hon'ble Home Minister said that we were taking the business of the house outside in the lawn. It is a correct statement? It is quite wrong. We have not undertaken any business of this House on the lawn. Does he mean to say that to sit there, to squat there and bring to the notice of this House and Government through this House some of our grievances and some of our aspirations as taking the business of this House to the lawns?

MR. SPEAKER.— Sri Sunthanker will kindly resume his seat. By what he is saying, I must have to call upon the Hon'ble Minister to reply so that he must say how his reasoning is correct and the Member's reasoning is wrong. I am not allowing that.

SRI B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—What incorrect statement I am making? Let me know, Sir.

Speaker's Statement *re:* Treatment Afforded to A. L. C. Member.

MR. SPEAKER.—He may kindly resume his seat. Now I have to deal with the matter raised by Sri Lakkappa. On a prior occasion, the Hon'ble Member Sri Lakkappa gave notice of two privilege motions. The first one related to the Hon'ble Member of the Council being not treated fairly in the Hospital. Another matter about which he give notice relates to certain police officer having touched his body, manhandled him or obstructed him when he was coming to the Vidhana Soudha. These two are matters of privilege. Under the rules, no member is entitled to present two matters of privilege on a single day. The member has to choose the first one or the second one. If he leave it to me, I will choose and then deal with it. He cannot have both at the same time The first one relates to Sri Anjanappa a sitting Member of the Upper House and the second one relates to the Member himself. According to the rules, I can deal with the first. I am not competent to deal with the second because when he gave notice of the first, he has exhausted his right under the rules, and so the second one I am unable to entertain now. First I will deal on the merits. So far as that is concerned, there is no regular motion and it cannot become a regular motion until I have given consent. I cannot given consent to a motion of privilege in respect of that incident. That incident has already been dealt with by the Hon'ble Minister for Health. It relates to certain breach of privilege or alleged breach of privilege by a Member of the Legislative Council not being given proper treatment to which he was entitled. In the first place, the amenities that a Member is entitled to is not a matter of privilege, and facilities for certain other purposes, social or other purposes are not matters of privilege. Premising for the sake of argument that it does come within the ambit of privilege, the member concerned is a Member of the other House. Privilege is not a matter which a Member carries